

REMARKS

Applicants have now had an opportunity to carefully consider the Examiner's comments set forth in the Office Action of January 21, 2004.

All of the Examiner's objections and rejections are traversed.

Reexamination and reconsideration are respectfully requested.

The Office Action

Claim 1 stands objected to because of cited informalities.

Claims 2-5, 10-14 and 19-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

Claims 1-6, 9-14 and 17-21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Naegle et al. (US Pub 2001/0033287 hereinafter as Naegle).

Claims 7, 8, 15 and 16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Naegle et al. (US Pub 2001/0033287).

Non-Art Objections and Rejections

Regarding the Examiner's objection to claim 1, both claims 1 and 17 have been amended, and the appropriate corrections of the noted informality have been made. It is respectfully submitted that the claims are now in proper form and that the objection be withdrawn.

Applicants have also amended claims 2-5 and 10-13. It is submitted that such amendments overcome the Examiner's rejection. Claims 19-20 are submitted to be clear as written in that pixel values are not specifically recited in claim 18. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claims 2-5, 10-14 and 19-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph be withdrawn.

The Claims Patentably Distinguish over the Cited Art

As a brief review, the Applicants' development relates to a method and/or apparatus for computation of associative operations over fixed sized regions of a digital image. An associative operation is selectively performed, at least once, to determine a property of the fixed region. Independent claims 1, 9 and 18 recite the use of an associative operation.

The applicants respectfully submit that Naegle does not teach or fairly suggest that an associative operation be performed on an array of pixel values in a fixed region of a digital image. Rather, Naegle discloses a computer graphics system utilizing a super-sampled sample buffer for refreshing a display (paragraph [0022]). The Examiner cites paragraphs [0076] and [0162] of Naegle as examples of the cited reference anticipating the phrase "performing an associative operation on the pixel values" of claims 1, 9 and 18. Paragraph [0076] of Naegle teaches providing various "sample modes for pixels", such as taking multiple samples per pixel or taking a single sample per pixel. Also, paragraph [0162] of Naegle discloses rendering a sample using the samples color, alpha and other attributes. The paragraphs use the word "associated" in terms of information being associated with samples, pixels, bins, or vertices; however, this is a concept unrelated to performance of an associative operation.

Naegle does not teach or fairly suggest performing an associative operation to determine properties of regions of images, as described in connection with the presently described embodiments. For at least this reason, the Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1, 9 and 18, and respective dependent claims 2-8, 10-17 and 19-21, are distinguishable over the cited art.

CONCLUSION

For the reasons detailed above, it is respectfully submitted all claims remaining in the application (Claims 1-21) are now in condition for allowance. An early notice to that effect is therefore earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

FAY, SHARPE, FAGAN,
MINNICH & McKEE, LLP

Date

July 15, 2004


Joseph D. Dreher
Reg. No. 37,123
1100 Superior Avenue, 7th Floor
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-2579
(216) 861-5582